



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,049	12/28/2000	Xia Dai	042390.P10232	8997

7590 12/23/2003

John P. Ward
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

CHANG, YEAN HSI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2835

DATE MAILED: 12/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

09/752,049

Applicant(s)

DAI, XIA

Examiner

Yean-Hsi Chang

Art Unit

2835

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6,8,9,11,12,15,21 and 23-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,6,8,9,11,12,15,21 and 23-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3, 6, 11, 21 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts, Jr. et al. (US 6,285,911 B1) in view of Walker et al. (US 5,933,609).

Watts teaches a detachable electronic display screen (13, fig. 17) comprising:

- A processor (inherent feature of 13, not shown) (claims 1, 6, 21 and 25)
- The electronic display screen to function as an electronic display screen when docked to a base computer (10, fig. 17) and to function as an information processing device when detached from the base (a computer is an information processing device) (claims 1, 11 and 21)
- Wherein the base computer including a processor (U140, fig. 33), a random access memory (inherent feature of a processor, not shown), and a hard disk drive (18, fig. 1) (claims 1 and 21)

- Wherein the information processing device includes operations of a palm computer (inherent feature of 13, not shown) (claims 3 and 24)

Watts fails to teach the electronic display screen comprising a suspend-to-RAM (STR) feature to dynamically transition the electronic display between a low power display mode when docked to the base and a higher power computer mode when detached from the base.

Walker teaches a STR feature (see col. 4, lines 65-67) which can turn a processor to be asleep for saving power.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Watts with the STR feature taught by Walker for saving power.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts, Jr. et al. in view of Walker et al, further in view of Kochis et al. (US 5,825,617).

Watts in view of Walker discloses the claimed invention except the electronic display screen comprising a battery (36, fig. 1) being mounted on an edge of the display screen.

Kochis teaches an electronic display screen (301, fig. 13) comprising a battery (36, fig. 1) being mounted on an edge of the display screen.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Watts modified by Walker

with the electronic screen taught by Kochis for minimizing the thickness of the display.

4. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts, Jr. et al. in view of Walker et al, further in view of Newman et al. (US 6,359,777 B1).

Watts in view of Walker discloses the claimed invention except the electronic display screen comprising a battery being mounted on the back of the display screen for saving front area.

Newman teaches a mobile computer having a battery (12, fig. 2) mounted on back of a display screen (7, fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Watts modified by Walker with the battery taught by Newman for the purpose of front side area savings

5. Claims 12 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts, Jr. et al. in view of Walker et al, further in view of Lemke et al. (US 5,850,209).

Watts, Jr. et al. in view of Walker et al. discloses the claimed invention except that the electronic display screen can access base resources through a wireless link when the electronic display screen is detached from the base.

Lemke teaches a potable computer (10', fig. 5) having a wireless electronic display screen (38', fig. 5).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Watts modified by Walker with the electronic display screen taught by Lemke so that the electronic display screen can access the resources of the base through a wireless link.

6. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watts, Jr. et al. in view of Walker et al, further in view of Kochis et al. (US 5,825,617).

Watts in view of Walker discloses the claimed invention except the electronic display screen (301, fig. 13) being able to receive a point and press input and a scribble input.

Kochis teaches an electronic display screen can receive a point and press input and a scribble input (see col. 9, lines 9-10, and col. 11, lines 65-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Watts modified by Walker with the electronic screen taught by Kochis for multi-choice of user input.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Correspondence


Art Unit: 2835

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yean-Hsi Chang whose telephone number is (703) 306-5798. The examiner can normally be reached on 07:30-16:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Darren Schuberg can be reached on (703) 308-4815. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3431 for regular communications and for After Final communications. There are RightFAX numbers and provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt by the USPTO: Before-Final (703-872-9318) and After-Final (703-872-9319).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8558.

Yean-Hsi Chang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2835
December 15, 2003

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Yean Hsi Chang", written in dark ink.